


Remarks

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 7-8 as being anticipated by Walt, II et al. (US Pat. No 7,062,831). *Office Action.* p. 2. Turning first to claim 1, the Examiner argues that “Walt, II et al teaches a method for assembling a component in an assembly, the method including the steps of: positioning the component in the assembly in accordance with a proposed position in the assembly (see column 3 lines 1-17); sensing that the component is in its correct special position in the assembly by use of sensing means capable of sensing spatial relationship and/or connection of the component in relation to the assembly (see column 3 lines 10-17); and communicating information regarding the sensed spatial relationship and/or connection to information processing means (see Figure 1 and column 5 lines 42-48).” *Id.* The Examiner further rejects Applicant’s previous arguments, made on 1/4/10, that Walt II discloses the need for at least two different types of targets whereas Applicant’s invention does not require multiple targets. *Id. at p. 3.* Further, the Examiner states that the argument is not persuasive because the claims do not teach away from sensing and positioning multiple components. *Id.* Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this argument in light of the below additional arguments and clarifications.

Walt, II et al discloses an assembly system comprising a fixture holding the article of assembly, and first and second targets fixed relative to the fixture that

correspond to first and second fastening locations on the articles of assembly. *Walt, II, column 3, lines 1-17.* Walt, II et al further discloses the need for at least two different types of targets. *Id. at column 2 lines 55-60.* These targets 50a-c are physical locations seen in the below Fig. 1 and correspond to fastening locations 52a-c.



The targets in Walt, II are needed for positioning whereas Applicant's invention does not need a plurality targets such as these for positioning which is a clear improvement over Walt, II. Further, there is nothing in Applicant's invention that would analogize with the at least two different target limitation that Walt, II requires. *Walt, II, at column 2 lines 55-60.* Additionally, each of the targets of Walt, II allow for differentiation of the other targets. *Id. at column 5, lines 40-42.* If at least two or more distinctive targets are not required, then how can Applicant's invention not teach away from Walt II? Walt, II teaches that its assembly system must have two or more distinctive targets and assembly situations where there is only one target must be disclaimed. As such, Applicant respectfully asks that the Examiner reconsider the rejection to Claim 1.

Claims 7 and 8 are dependant on Claim 1 and Applicant believes they will be allowable once Claim 1 is reconsidered.

Conclusion


In light of the above claim amendments, Applicant believes this application is now in good form for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner grant allowance in this case.

Authorization

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Reply, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3791.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Director is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 50-3791.

Sincerely:



Heather A. Kartsones
Reg. No. 53,732